



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Choice of the Apostles. No doubt there were many reasons which concurred in Jesus' mind in favor of the choice of the particular men whom He did choose as his apostles. But there was one fundamental thing by which He was moved, according to Mr. Latham, and that was their fitness for *testifying to facts*. "It is this character of witnesses which distinguishes the Apostles from all other depositories of a Master's cause." "In the character of appointed witnesses of the Resurrection they stood alone," "I find," says he, "in the Twelve a special fitness for the particular work which it fell to them to perform. They brought to the attestation of the Resurrection *the concurring evidence of eleven eye-witnesses, simple, truth-loving, matter-of-fact men, of different types of mind*." The author develops at some length the various elements of this italicized statement. (1) Consider the unanimity of the eleven in their testimony to this fact. The chances against the agreement of the entire body in an illusion or a misrepresentation are enormous. (2) The apostles conveyed the impression, in their testimony as given in the Acts and Epistles, of certainty, settled and serene. They had not been always so. (3) The difference in character among them is marked. Yet they agreed in their story when (a) they neither had any of the objects of human desire to gain by their agreement (b) nor were they mastered by any leader among them but were men of independent mind accustomed to dispute and disagree. That any eleven should thus agree is strange; that this particular eleven should do so is stranger still. (4) But though each individual had his specific character, they had one fundamental element in common. They belonged to the lower middle class, plain and homely in mind, talk and action. They are literal-minded, matter-of-fact, practical, laboring men. Such men are good witnesses, for they have eyes for everything. Thus two points are made. The apostles were singularly adapted for giving testimony to a fact—and if such men were picked out, it must have been in view of some great event for which witnesses were required. This is exactly what Christianity does centre in—a stupendous Fact.

Notes on Passages in James. In the exposition of Dr. Plummer are some interesting interpretations of special passages a few of which may be briefly reproduced:

1. James 1:9, *and the rich in that he is made low*. This humiliation is not that of Christian submission. The rich unbeliever is meant. The passage is one of severe irony. "Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate; and the rich man—what is he to glory in?—let him glory in the only thing upon which he can count with certainty, viz., his being brought low; because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away."

2. 4:5, 6. These two verses are very difficult. Three questions arise, (1) Are two Scriptures quoted or only one? (2) Who is it that "longeth" or "lusteth?" is it God, or the Holy Spirit, or our own human spirit? What is it that is longed for by God or the Spirit? In reply to (1) it is held that here is a condensation of several utterances in the Old Testament. In respect to (2) it is maintained that the good sense of the verb i. e., "longeth" is more in harmony with New Testament usage. The most satisfactory rendering then makes the Holy Spirit the subject, "Even unto jealousy doth the Spirit which He made to dwell in us yearn," and (3) that for which the Spirit yearns is "ourselves." "God is a jealous God, and the Divine love is a jealous love; it

brooks no rival. And when his Spirit takes up its abode in us, it cannot rest until it possesses us wholly, to the exclusion of all alien affections."

3. James 5: 19, 20 *shall cover a multitude of sins*. Whose sins? Not the sins of him who converts the erring brother. Against this are two reasons (1) Nowhere else in Scripture do we find such a doctrine that a man may cover his own sins by inducing another sinner to repent. The opposite is not obscurely intimated e. g., in 1 Cor. 9: 27. (2) James could not have contemplated the possibility of a Christian undertaking the task of converting others while his own conscience was burdened with a multitude of sins. It is the sins of the converted sinner that are covered. The phrase "cover sins" reminds one of Ps. 32: 1 and it seems to have been common among the Jews.

4. James 5: 14, 15, *anointing him with oil*, etc. In respect to this debated passage, the writer thinks that it is most probable that the purpose intended for the oil to serve was either to be the channel or instrument of a supernatural cure or an aid to the sick person's faith. And the reason why oil was selected was that it was believed to have healing properties. It is obvious, on the one hand that James does not recommend this oil merely as medicine, for he does not say that the oil shall cure, nor yet that the oil with prayer shall do so, and more than that, the anointing is to be done by the elders which would not be necessary if it were merely medicinal. "On the other hand, it seems to be too much to say that the anointing had nothing to do with bodily healing at all and was simply a means of grace for the sick."

Tirosh and Yayin. In the recent number of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (vol. x. 1), Prof. H. G. Mitchell offers the results of a special examination of these words. *Tirosh* is frequently applied to the juice of the grape while it is still in the fruit or when it has just been expressed by man. Wine as a product generally takes this name and in the majority of cases it is regarded as a good. The reason for prizing it was that it finally became wine (Mic. 6: 15). Deut. 14: 23, shows that the juice of the grape is tithed as *tirosh* but drunk as *yayin*. In all the cases it is the promise that is in the *tirosh* which makes it either desirable or harmful. *Yayin* is used of wine as a drink which had an important place in the life of the Hebrews. It was prized for its flavor and the exhilaration it produced (Ps. 104: 15). The use of wine is commended, the abuse is condemned. The priests were forbidden its use because of the frailty of human nature. The Nazarites were forbidden because thus they could best indicate their separation from their fellows. The Rechabites are commended not because they abstained from wine simply but for honoring the rule of their ancestor. This rule also forbade them to live in houses and sow seed. Jeremiah was teaching a lesson of fidelity to God from their example of fidelity to Jonadab. *Tirosh* and *Yayin*, then, denote not two kinds of wine but the same wine at different stages, before and after fermentation. At first it is regarded as a simple product of husbandry and valued for the promise that is in it. Finally it is treated as a drink, and praised or condemned as it is used or abused. It is prohibited only to certain persons at certain times or for exceptional reasons.

The Greek of the Apocalypse. The peculiar character of the language in which the Apocalypse is written and the difficulty of understanding how the same person could have written in two styles so different as that of the Gospel of John and this of the Apocalypse have long occupied the attention of